



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,521	12/18/2000	John Mathon	20581000110	5157

20350 7590 05/04/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
----------

KENNEDY, LESA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/740,521

Applicant(s)

MATHON ET AL.

Examiner

Lesa Kennedy

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on December 18, 2000. Claims 1-34 are pending examination. Claims 1-34 are directed towards a method and system for reliable data delivery.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

- Item 208 in Fig. 3.

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The specification refers to item 309 not shown in Fig. 3 (see pg. 19, line 12)

- Page 28, lines 4 – 14 refers to items shown in Fig. 2A, not Fig. 2B as stated in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Annapareddy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,862).

As to claim 1, Annapareddy teaches a method comprising:

sending a message from the message source to the message destination [col. 3, lines 60-66; Annapareddy discloses sending a message to a destination node];

receiving the message at a route point, wherein the route point is a point in the digital network between the message source and the message destination [col. 3, lines 60-66;

Annapareddy discloses receiving the message at a child node (route point)];

sending the original message from the route point to the message destination along a first communication path [col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 5; Annapareddy discloses that a child node (route point) transmits identical message copies to the destination across different links]; and

sending a copy of the message from the route point to the message destination along a second communication path, wherein the second communication path is at least partially different from the first communication path [col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 5; Annapareddy discloses that a child node (route point) transmits identical message copies to the destination across different links].

As to claim 2, Annapareddy teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:  
determining when either of the message or message copy is received by the message destination [col. 5, lines 42-45; Annapareddy discloses that the destination node determines when a message is received]; and

in response to the step of determining, preventing the non-received message from being received by the destination [col. 5, lines 45-49; Annapareddy discloses that the destination node cancels the link to prevent receiving another copy of the message].

As to claim 3, Annapareddy teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the step of determining includes a substep of: maintaining a record of messages that have been transferred to the message destination [col. 3, lines 49-59; Annapareddy discloses maintaining information on the status of each message].

As to claim 5, Annapareddy teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the amount of data sent to a message destination is tracked by recording information at the route point [col. 3, lines 49-59; Annapareddy discloses that a node (route point) maintains information on the status of each message].

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4, 7, 10-19 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annapareddy in view of Jolly et al. (GB 1427319).

As to claim 4, Annapareddy teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 1 above).

Annapareddy fails to teach that a copy of the message is stored in an archive.

However, Jolly teaches that a copy of the message is stored in an archive [col. 1, lines 18-20; Jolly discloses that the nodes (route points) stores received messages].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly so as to store messages at each node. One would be motivated to do so to ensure that a copy of the message is retained until it is established that the sent message has arrived at its destination.

As to claim 7, Annapareddy teaches a process comprising the steps of:

providing information to be sent from a source to a destination, said source and said destination coupled to said distributed networked computer system [col. 3, lines 25-32; Annapareddy discloses sending messages between a source and a destination node in a network];

generating a message at said source, said message comprising the information and routing information [col. 3, lines 25-32; col. 4, lines 48-49; Annapareddy discloses sending a message comprising routing information and data from a source to a destination node];

transmitting said message to a selected route point in said distributed computer network using a first communication backbone [col. 3, lines 60-62; Annapareddy discloses the transmission of a message to multiple child nodes (route points) via plural paths (communication backbones)];

transmitting said message to at least one additional selected route point in said distributed computer network using a second communication backbone [col. 3, lines 60-62; Annapareddy discloses the transmission of a message to multiple child nodes (route points) via plural paths (communication backbones)]; and

transmitting said message from route point to said destination [col. 3, lines 62-65; Annapareddy discloses that the message is transmitted from each child node (route point) to the destination]; and

eliminating duplicate copies of said message at said destination [col. 5, lines 42-49; Annapareddy discloses that the destination node cancels a link to avoid receiving duplicate messages].

Annapareddy fails to teach the limitation of archiving said message at each route point.

However, Jolly teaches the limitation of archiving said message at each route point [col. 1, lines 18-20; Jolly discloses that the nodes (route points) stores received messages].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly so as to store messages at each node. One would be motivated to do so to ensure that a copy of the message is retained until it is established that the sent message has arrived at its destination.

As to claim 10, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 7 further including the steps of:

providing routing information to said source [ col. 4, lines 48-49; Annapareddy discloses that each message from the source contains routing information]; and

associating an archive to said source [col. 1, lines 37-45; Jolly discloses that messages are sent from a source to a node which stores the message].

As to claim 11, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 10 further including the step of associating said source with selected route points [col. 4, lines 48-50; Annapareddy discloses that each message from the source to a node (route point) contains routing information], said associating step further including the step of updating said association in response to alerts issued by at least one of said route points [col. 3, lines 49-52; Annapareddy discloses that each node returns status information to the source regarding its ability to deliver the message].

As to claim 12, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 11 further including a step of providing a network controller coupled to said distributed



computer network for configuring said distributed computer network in response to said alert [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses rerouting messages to avoid unavailable nodes].

As to claim 13, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 11 further including the step of providing real-time performance monitoring and management of the hardware components comprising said distributed computer network [col. 3, lines 49-59; Annapareddy discloses monitoring the status of nodes (route points) in a network].

As to claim 14, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 13 wherein said monitoring and management step further includes the step of responding to said alert [col. 5, lines 14-22; Annapareddy discloses responding to a control code point (alert) to stop transmitting data].

As to claim 15, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 14 further including a step of updating a database showing the operational status of each component in said distributed computer network in response to said alert, said database accessible by said network controller [col. 3, lines 49-52; Annapareddy discloses that the parent node (network controller) maintains status information on all child nodes].

As to claim 16, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 7 further including a step of generating an alert in response to detection of a failure to complete the transmission of said message from said source to said destination [col. 4, lines 63-66; Annapareddy discloses that nodes issue a code control point (alert) when they are unable to transmit a message].

As to claim 17, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 16 further including a step of updating a database in response to said failure detection [col.

3, lines 49-52; Annapareddy discloses that the parent node (network controller) maintains status information on all child nodes] and configuring said distributed computer network in response to changes to said database, said database accessible to said network controller [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses rerouting messages to avoid unavailable nodes].

As to claim 18, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the process of claim 17 further including a step of associating said source with selected route points [col. 3, lines 49-52; Annapareddy discloses that the parent node (source) maintains status information on the child nodes], said associating step further including the step of updating said association in response to said failure detection [col. 3, lines 49-52; Annapareddy discloses that the parent node (source) maintains status information on the child nodes].

As to claim 19, Annapareddy teaches an apparatus comprising:

means for generating messages, said generating means coupled to said network [col. 5, lines 24-25; Annapareddy discloses sending messages in a network];

a first route point [col. 5, lines 25-27; node A];

a second route point [col. 5, lines 25-27; node F];

means for transmitting said message to said first selected route point in said distributed computer network using a first communication backbone and to said second selected route point in said distributed computer network using a second communication backbone [col. 5, lines 27-34; Annapareddy discloses transmitting multiple copies of a message to nodes (route points) via different communication backbones];

means for transmitting said message from said first route point to said destination using said first communication backbone [col. 5, lines 29-34; Annapareddy discloses transmitting a

message from multiple nodes (route points) to the destination using different communication backbones];

means for transmitting said message from said at least one additional route point to said destination using said second communication background [col. 5, lines 29-34; Annapareddy discloses transmitting a message from multiple nodes (route points) to the destination using different communication backbones];

means for eliminating duplicate copies of said message at said destination [col. 5, lines 42-49; Annapareddy discloses that the destination node cancels the link to avoid duplicate copies of the message]; and

means for recovering said information at said destination [col. 5, lines 42-45; Annapareddy discloses that the destination node selects the message from one of the nodes (route points)].

Annapareddy fails to teach the limitation of means for archiving said message at each route point, said archival means associated with said route point.

However, Jolly teaches the limitation of means for archiving said message at each route point, said archival means associated with said route point [col. 1, lines 18-20; Jolly discloses that the nodes (route points) stores received messages].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly so as to store messages at each node. One would be motivated to do so to ensure that a copy of the message is retained until it is established that the sent message has arrived at its destination.

As to claim 24, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the apparatus of claim 19 further including a distributed database means for archiving said message at each route point, said archival means coupled to said network [col. 1, lines 18-20; Jolly discloses nodes (route points) in a network which store messages].

As to claim 25, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the apparatus of claim 19 further including means for generating an alert, said alert generating means associated with said route point [col. 4, lines 63-66; Annapareddy discloses that nodes (route points) generate control code points (alerts) when they are unable to establish a connection].

As to claim 26, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the apparatus of claim 25 further including means for responding to said alert; said alert responding means coupled to said network [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses a network that reroutes messages to avoid unavailable nodes (route points)].

As to claim 27, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the apparatus of claim 26 further including means for activating a response to said alert; said activating means coupled to said alert responding means network [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses a network that reroutes messages to avoid unavailable nodes (route points)].

As to claim 28, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the apparatus of claim 25 further including means for re-configuring said distributed computer network, said reconfiguring means comprising means for transmitting configuration information to said connector such that said message is transmitted to at least one route point in said distributed computer network other than said first or second route point [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses a network that reroutes messages to avoid unavailable nodes (route points)].

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annapareddy in view of Sleeper (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,074).

As to claim 6, Annapareddy teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 1 above).

Annapareddy fails to teach that an XML envelope is applied to the message.

However, Sleeper teaches of an XML envelope being applied to a message [col. 9, lines 19-24; Sleeper discloses encapsulating messages in XML data packages (envelopes)].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Sleeper so as to apply XML encapsulation to messages. One would be motivated to do so to keep the contents of the message private.

Claims 8-9, 20-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annapareddy in view of Jolly et al., and further in view of Hanzek (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,726)

As to claim 8, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 7 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation of providing an application program interface (API) at said source to enable business-to-business application programs to obtain information contained in said message.

However, Hanzek teaches the limitation of providing an application program interface (API) at said source to enable business-to-business application programs to obtain information

contained in said message [col. 7, lines 30-38; col. 16, lines 13-19; Hanzek discloses a system enabling business to business communications between a consumer and a product providing entity].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek so as to include business-to-business functionality. One would be motivated to do so to enable reliable message delivery in an e-commerce environment.

As to claim 9, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek teaches the process of claim 8 above, further including the step of providing an application program interface (API) at said destination to enable business to business application programs acquire the information contained in said message [col. 7, lines 30-38; col. 16, lines 13-19; Hanzek discloses a system enabling business to business communications between a consumer and a product providing entity].

As to claim 20, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 19 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation wherein said means for generating messages further comprises a program interface to business-to-business application programs.

However, Hanzek teaches the limitation wherein the means for generating messages further comprises a program interface to business to business application programs [col. 7, lines 30-38; col. 16, lines 13-19; Hanzek discloses a system enabling business to business communications between a consumer and a product providing entity through an application program interface].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek so as to include business-to-business functionality. One would be motivated to do so to enable reliable message delivery in an e-commerce environment.

As to claim 21, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek teaches the apparatus of claim 20 further including means for establishing communication between said means for generating messages and said route points [col. 3, lines 25-29; col. 5, lines 24-34; Annapareddy discloses a communication link between a source node (means for generating message) and intermediate nodes (route points)].

As to claim 23, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek teaches the apparatus of claim 20 further comprising means for encrypting said message [col. 14, lines 34-45; Hanzek discloses receiving encrypted data].

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annapareddy in view of Jolly et al., further in view of Hanzek, and further in view of Sleeper (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,074).

As to claim 22, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 20 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation of means for creating an envelope, said envelope comprising routing information and an opaque payload.

However, Sleeper teaches the limitation of means for creating an envelope, said envelope comprising routing information and an opaque payload [col. 9, lines 19-24; Sleeper discloses

routing XML data packages (envelopes) to a recipient who unpacks the XML package so as to view its contents].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of Hanzek, in view of Sleeper so as to apply XML encapsulation to messages. One would be motivated to do so to keep the contents of the message private.

Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annapareddy in view of Jolly et al., and further in view of DeVos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,552).

As to claim 29, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 25 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation of further including means for recovering said message from said archive.

However, De Vos teaches the limitation of including means for recovering said message from said archive [col. 1, lines 46-52; De Vos discloses a delivery storage medium unit for retrieving data from an archive].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of De Vos, in view of so as to allow retrieval of messages stored at the nodes. One would be motivated to do so to enable resending a message not received at the destination.



As to claim 30, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of De Vos teaches the apparatus of claim 29 further including means for tracking receipt of messages at said destination [col. 2, lines 55-62; Jolly discloses determining that a sent message has arrived at its destination].

As to claim 31, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Jolly, in view of De Vos teaches the apparatus of claim 30 further including means for accessing said archives to acquire said message and to determine delivery information [col. 1, lines 46-52; De Vos discloses that a delivery storage medium unit retrieves data from an archive and outputs the data with routing information].

Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annapareddy in view of Sleeper, further in view of Jolly et al., and further in view of DeVos et al.

As to claim 32, Annapareddy teaches an apparatus comprising a plurality of route points [col. 4, lines 25-34; nodes as route points].

Annapareddy fails to teach the limitation of the apparatus comprising: a plurality of connectors, each of which coupled by said network to at least a pair of said route points; said connectors adapted to receive information and configuring said information in an envelope prior to transmitting said envelope to said route points; a distributed database for archiving said envelope at each route point, said distributed database coupled to said route points by said network; a second plurality of connectors, each of which coupled by said network to at least two of said plurality of route points, said second plurality of connectors adapted to acquire said

envelope from said at least two of said plurality of route points and for determining whether one of said envelope is a duplicate of an earlier received envelope; means for acquiring said envelope from either said route point or from said distributed database.

However, Sleeper teaches the limitation of a connector adapted to receive information and configuring said information in an envelope prior to transmitting said envelope to said route points [col. 8, lines 56-59; Sleeper discloses a PRS messenger (connector) receiving information from a POS system (source) and packaging the information before sending it to its destination].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Sleeper so as to package a message before transmitting it to each node. One would be motivated to do so to keep the contents of the message private.

Jolly teaches the limitation of a distributed database for archiving said envelope at each route point, said distributed database coupled to said route points by said network [col. 1, lines 18-20; Jolly discloses that messages are stored at the nodes (route points)].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Sleeper, in view of Jolly so as to store messages at each node. One would be motivated to do so to ensure that a copy of the message is retained until it is established that the sent message has arrived at its destination.

The combination of Annapareddy in view of Sleeper teaches the limitation of a second plurality of connectors adapted to acquire said envelope from said at least two of said plurality of route points and for determining whether one of said envelope is a duplicate of an earlier received envelope [col. 9, lines 19-24; Sleeper discloses receiving an XML data package

(envelope); col. 5, lines 42-49; Annapareddy discloses accepting a message from a node (route point) and rejecting duplicate copies of that message from other nodes (route points)].

De Vos teaches the limitation of means for acquiring said envelope from either said route point or from said distributed database [col. 1, lines 46-52; De Vos discloses a delivery storage medium unit for retrieving data from an archive].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Annapareddy in view of Sleeper, in view of Jolly, in view of De Vos so as to allow retrieval of messages stored at the nodes. One would be motivated to do so to enable resending a message not received at the destination.

As to claim 33, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Sleeper, in view of Jolly, in view of De Vos teaches the apparatus of claim 32 further including a network controller coupled to said network [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses a network controlling entity to reroute messages].

As to claim 34, the combination of Annapareddy in view of Sleeper, in view of Jolly, in view of De Vos teaches the apparatus of claim 33 further including a network operations center for real-time performance monitoring of said network [col. 3, lines 49-52; Annapareddy discloses monitoring the status of nodes in a network], said network operations adapted to respond to an alert [col. 1, lines 26-28; Annapareddy discloses rerouting messages to avoid unavailable nodes] and for updating said network manager of the operational status of each component in said distributed computer network in response to said alert [col. 3, lines 49-52; col. 4, lines 63-66; Annapareddy discloses updating the status of nodes in a network].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lesa Kennedy whose telephone number is (703) 305-8865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

*Andrew Caldwell*  
Andrew Caldwell